



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,296	05/24/2005	Andreja Vukmirovic	BP/G-32982A/LEK	9213
72554	7590	10/17/2008	EXAMINER	
SANDOZ INC			HOLLOMAN, NANNETTE	
506 CARNEFIE CENTER				
PRINCETON, NJ 08540				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,296	Applicant(s) VUKMIROVIC ET AL.	
	Examiner NANNETTE HOLLOMAN	Art Unit 1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/14/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-16 and 18 are pending. This is the first Action on the merits of the claims.

Response to Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-16 and 18) and the election of "the absence of additional components" in the reply filed on July 7, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that:

- 1) the invention claim group s must be independent or distinct; and
- 2) there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required. This is not found persuasive because the single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 i.e., "Unity of Invention" applies to application filed under national stage (see MPEP 1850 [R-5]) that states "Any international application must relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Article 3(4)(iii) and 17(3)(a), PCT Rule 3.1, and 37 CFR 1.475). Observance of this requirement is checked by the International Searching Authority and may be relevant in the national (or regional) phase". The "special technical feature" must make a contribution over the art.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 14-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or

Art Unit: 1612

linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on July 7, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112/101

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16 and 18 provide for the use of PVP in claim 16 and of a composition of claim 1 (claim 18), but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App.

Art Unit: 1612

1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

First paragraph

Enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating, does not reasonably provide enablement for “preventing”. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

To be enabling, the specification of the patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Explaining what is meant by “undue experimentation,” the Federal Circuit has stated:

The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed to enable the determination of how to practice a desired embodiment of the claimed invention. PPG v. Guardian, 75 F.3d 1558, 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1996).¹

¹ As pointed out by the court in In re Angstadt, 537 F.2d 498 at 504 (CCPA 1976), the key word is “undue”, not “experimentation”.

The factors that may be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation are set forth by In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art,
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

These factors are always applied against the background understanding that scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability involved. In re Fisher, 57 CCPA 1099, 1108, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (1970). Keeping that in mind, the Wands factors are relevant to the instant fact situation for the following reasons:

1. The nature of the invention, state and predictability of the art, and relative

The invention relates to “prevention” of diseases indicated for erythropoietin (EPO). The relative skill of those in the art is high, that of an MD or PHD. That factor is outweighed, however, by the unpredictable nature of the art. As illustrative of the state of the art, the examiner cites Mastanduno et al. (U.S. Pharmacist, [online], Retrieved [2008-10-07]) disclose the use of erythropoietin for “management” of anemia of patients that currently have anemia (Recombinant Human Erythropoietin). Mastanduno et al.

Art Unit: 1612

further disclose anemia may develop suddenly in patients with cancer, which is understood to be unpredictable (Signs and Symptoms) and therefore one skilled in the art can not reasonably predict the basis and type of subject to which the instant composition can be administered in order to have the “preventive” effect.

2. The breadth of the claims

Since the instant specification provides no limiting definition of the term “prevention”, the term will be interpreted expansively. The term “prevention” may vary widely in meaning, from “preventing” a disease from occurring to “preventing” it from progressing. Nor is the term limited by any time frame.

The claims are thus very broad insofar as they suggest that one will not experience the disease when taking the claimed agent; that should one get the disease, it will not worsen; or that following its treatment, it will not recur. While such “prevention” might theoretically be possible under strictly controlled laboratory conditions, as a practical matter it is nearly impossible to achieve in the “real world” in which patients live.

3. The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

The specification provides no direction or guidance for practicing the claimed invention in its “full scope”. No reasonably specific guidance is provided concerning useful therapeutic protocols for use, other than “treating”. The latter is corroborated by the working examples.

4. The quantity of experimentation necessary

Because of the known unpredictability of the art, and in the absence of experimental evidence, no one skilled in the art would accept the assertion that the instantly claimed agents could be predictably used to “prevent” as inferred by the claim and contemplated by the specification. Accordingly, the instant claims do not comply with the enablement requirement of §112, since to practice the claimed invention in its “full scope” a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation, with no assurance of success.

5. Suggested alternative language

Since the term “treating” is inclusive of various administrative timing schemes and thus provides adequate coverage for all reasonably successful therapies (prophylactic or active), the examiner recommends deleting the term “preventing” and simply reciting “treatment” only instead.

Written Description

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See, e.g., In re Wilder, 22 USPQ 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (Holding that a claim was

Art Unit: 1612

not adequately described because the specification did 'little more than outline goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.')

Mere indistinct terms (such as "additives" used herein), however, may not suffice to meet the written description requirement. This is particularly true when a compound is claimed in purely functional terms. See Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle, 69 USPQ2d 1886 (CAFC 2004) at 1892, stating:

The appearance of mere indistinct words in a specification or a claim, even an original claim, does not necessarily satisfy that requirement. A description of an anti-inflammatory steroid, i.e., a steroid (a generic structural term) described even in terms of its functioning of lessening inflammation of tissues fails to distinguish any steroid from others having the same activity or function. A description of what a material does, rather than of what it is, usually does not suffice.... The disclosure must allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter purportedly described. (Emphasis added).

Conversely, a description of a chemical genus will usually comprise a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. See Univ. of Calf. V. Eli Lilly, 43 USPQ 2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). This is analogous to enablement of a genus under Section 112, ¶ 1, by showing the enablement of a representative number of species within the genus.

A chemical genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. *If the genus has substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient number of species to reflect the variation within that genus*. See MPEP 2163. The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or

Art Unit: 1612

coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any *combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials* and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient. MPEP 2163.

Here, the specification does not provide a reasonably representative disclosure of useful “additives” generally, a potentially huge genus inclusive of many different compounds having widely divergent structures and functions. Specifically, the specification discloses only a limited number of species at page 5, lines 21-26, and these are not viewed as being reasonably representative of the genus in its claimed scope because no readily apparent combination of identifying characteristics is provided, other than the disclosure of those specific species as examples of the claimed genus.

Second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13 and 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term “essentially” renders the claim

Art Unit: 1612

indefinite. The specification does not contain guidelines or examples that would enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to the scope of the invention.

Claim 2 recites a limitation, "wherein the composition is free of additives derived from human and/or animal origin". It is unclear from the claim as recited and the specification as disclosed the nature of these "additives". Therefore, the claim as recited is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woog et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,419, as disclosed by applicant).

Woog et al. disclose a stable protein containing, a physiologically compatible buffer (Abstract). Woog et al. further disclose the protein as erythropoietin (here forth, EPO) (column 1, line 18). Woog et al. disclose a preparation which contains from 100 to 1 million U of erythropoietin (claims 4-5) (Woog et al. claim 12). Woog et al. disclose said physiologically compatible buffer as phosphate buffers (claim 9) to adjust the pH to a value of from 6.5 to 7.4, which is considered to meet the limitation of about 6 to about

Art Unit: 1612

8 (claim 6), about 6.8 to about 7.5 (claim 7), and about 7 (claim 8) (column 2, lines 57-59). Woog et al. disclose polyvinylpyrrolidone (here forth, PVP) (KOLLIDON® 12 PF)² as a stabilizer in formulation s1, TABLE 1 (column 6, example 6). Woog et al. disclose PVP in a concentration of 0.48%, which is considered to meet the limitation of in a range of about 0.01% to about 1% (claim 10), about 0.1% to about 1% (claim 11), and about 0.5% (claim 12) (column 8, TABLE 1, formulation s1). It is known in the art to disclose PVP in terms of the K value, and therefore KOLLIDON® 12 PF is considered to meet the limitation of K value in a range from K12 to K18 of instant claim 13. Woog et al. disclose injection of an aqueous solution (claim 3) of EPO to treat renal anaemia due to kidney insufficiency (claim 18) (column 1, lines 24-33). In regards to claim 2, Woog et al. disclose the addition of human or bovine serum albumin can bring about immunogenic reactions when injected, and disclose preparations free of human or bovine serum albumin (examples).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

² KOLLIDON® 12 PF (BASF, [online], KOLLIDON® 12 PF, Retrieved [2008-10-06]). This reference is used to disclose that KOLLIDON® 12 PF is a polyvinylpyrrolidone and is not relied upon for the basis of the rejection.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woog et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,419, as disclosed by applicant) as applied to claims 1 and 3-13 above, and further in view of Cymbalista (U.S. Patent No. 4,647,454, as disclosed by applicant).

Woog et al. as disclosed above does not disclose polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) as the sole stabilizer for the stabilization of erythropoietin (EPO) in an aqueous solution.

Cymbalista discloses the stabilization of a protein with PVP (column 1, lines 11 and 43-46). Cymbalista discloses PVP's maximal stabilizing effectiveness (Tables 1-6).

Art Unit: 1612

It would have been obvious to include PVP as the sole stabilizer of the preparation of Woog et al. motivated by the desire to achieve maximum stability as disclosed by Cymbalista.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13, 16 and 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/521298. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the instant application is drawn to a stable pharmaceutical composition of erythropoietin (EPO), wherein the composition comprises:

Art Unit: 1612

- a. a therapeutically effective amount of EPO
- b. a pharmaceutically acceptable pH buffering system, and
- c. polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP)

The difference is the polyvinylpyrrolidone of the instant application and the poloxamer polyol of the co-pending application. Therefore, the claims 1-13, 16 and 18 of the instant application and claims 1-20 of the co-pending application overlap in scope and they are obvious variants of each other and hence, the invention of the instant application is not distinct from the invention of the copending applicant

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANNETTE HOLLOMAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5231. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 800am-500pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612